43427

National Library of Canada
Canadian Theses Division
Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Division des thèses canadiennes

PERMISSION TO MICROFILM — AUTORISATION DE MICROFILMER

• Please print or type — Écrire en lettres moulées ou dactylographier

Full Name of Author — Nom complet de l'auteur

LINDA LOU HATT

Date of Birth — Date de naissance

OCTOBER 14, 1949

Country of Birth — Lieu de naissance

U.S.A.

Permanent Address — Résidence fixe

2218- 14th AVE. SOUTH
LETHBRIDGE, ALBERTA
CANADA

Title of Thesis — Titre de la thèse

THE PERCEPTION OF ASSERTIVE WOMEN

University — Université

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

Degree for which thesis was presented — Grade pour lequel cette thèse fut présentée

M Sc

Year this degree conferred — Année d'obtention de ce grade

1979

Name of Supervisor — Nom du directeur de thèse

DR. WARREN THORNGATE

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

Date

Oct. 12 '79

Signature

Linda L Hatt

NL-91 (4/77)

National Library of Canada

Cataloguing Branch
Canadian Theses Division

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Direction du catalogage
Division des thèses canadiennes

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us a poor photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de mauvaise qualité.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

The Perception of Assertive Women

by

© Linda Lou Hatt

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF Master of Science

Department of Psychology

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

1979

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled The Perception of Assertive Women submitted by Linda Lou Hatt in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science in Psychology.

Supervisor

William Schmeidler

Dallas Cullen

Date 18 July 1979

Dedication

This manuscript is dedicated to my grandfather, Albert Hatt, born 1887.

Abstract

The present study investigated how males and females evaluate passive, aggressive and assertive behavior in members of their own or the opposite sex. A distinction was made between assertive, passive and aggressive behavior as specified by Bower and Bower (1976). On the basis of an earlier study (Costrich, Feinstein, Kidder, Marecek, and Pascale, 1975), it was expected that male subjects would tend to evaluate passive behavior in males and aggressive or assertive behavior in females as less popular than aggressive males and passive females.

A series of audiotaped conversations between a target person and a participant listener were devised and presented to subjects. The two males and two females portraying the target person each read three versions of the script (aggressive, passive, assertive). A male and female were enlisted to portray the role of the listener. Subjects were asked to rate both the target person and the listener on a list of bipolar adjective scales.

The results of this research did not support the findings of Costrich et al. Males and females did not differ in their ratings of popularity for members of the same or opposite sex acting in an assertive, aggressive or passive manner. However, ratings of the target person indicated that aggressive and assertive females are perceived as more competent than passive females and that assertive males were also perceived as more competent than passive males. In

addition, the situation was shown to be an important variable in that assertive behavior may be perceived differently in an achievment situation than an interpersonal situation. Furthermore, the sex of the listener was also shown to influence the ratings of the target person. Idiosyncratic effects attributed to the individuals portraying the target person also effected how the target person was perceived. Finally, a contrast effect was demonstrated in the perception of the listener whose behavior was held constant across the varying behavior of the target person. The implications of situational and idiosyncratic variables are discussed.

Acknowledgments

It is with pleasure that I acknowledge the assistance of a number of people who contributed to the production of this thesis.

First, I wish to thank my supervisor, Dr. Warren Thorngate. His unique approach facilitated the completion of this document and made the entire project a pleasurable learning experience.

I am grateful to my committee members, Dr. W. Schneiderman, Dr. T. Nelson, and Dr. D. Cullen for their thoughtful comments and criticisms.

My appreciation is also extended to the people who assisted in the development of the stimulus tapes by effectively portraying the designated roles. I am indebted to Diane Gilchrist, Betty Wallace, Larry Stephan, Russ Powell, Kar-La Schokman-Gates and Dr. Warren Thorngate for their assistance in this endeavor.

I owe much to my friends, family and colleagues who endured my period of dedication and provided the necessary support and diversion. I am especially grateful to Russ Powell for the encouragement and moral support from start to finish.

Table of Contents

Chapter		Page
I.	Introduction	1
	A. Perceptions of Aggressive Women	5
	B. Rationale of the Present Study	7
II.	The Pilot Study	15
	A. Overview	15
III.	Methods	19
	A. Subjects	19
	B. Apparatus and Materials	19
	Stimulus Materials	19
	Response Materials	20
	C. Procedure	21
IV.	Results	22
	A. Series 1	22
	B. Series 2	25
	C. Series 3	26
V.	Discussion	27
VI.	The Main Study	30
	A. Overview	30
VII.	Method	32
	A. Subjects	32
	B. Stimulus Materials	32
	C. Response Materials	32
	D. Procedure	34

VIII. Results.....35

A. Effectiveness of the Manipulation.....35

B. Evaluation of the Student.....39

Popularity.....39

Competence.....40

Judgments of the Students.....42

Effect of the Sex of the Professor on Ratings of the Student.....44

Idiosyncratic Effects.....46

C. Evaluation of the Professor.....48

Effect of the Professor's Sex on Professor's Ratings.....51

Idiosyncratic Effects.....52

D. Androgyny Scores.....52

IX. Discussion.....55

A. Perception of the Target Person.....56

B. Effects of the Sex of the Listener on the Perception of the Target.....60

C. Evaluation of the Listener.....61

D. Idiosyncratic Effects.....63

E. Androgyny and the Target Ratings.....64

F. Conclusion.....65

References.....67

Appendices.....70

List of Tables

Table.....Page

1. Mean Ratings of the Target Person.....23
2. Judgments of the Target Person's Behavioral Style.....24
3. Summary of Significant Analysis of Variance Results for Ratings of the Student.....36
4. Significant Correlations for Ratings of Male and Female Students.....37
5. Mean Ratings of the Student.....38
6. Mean Ratings of Male and Female Students.....41
7. Responses to the Judgment Question.....43
8. Mean Competence and Sincerity Ratings for Students Interacting with a Male and a Female Professor.....45
9. Mean Rudeness Ratings of Students Interacting with a Male and Female Professor by Male and Female Subjects.....47
10. Summary of Significant Analysis of Variance Results for Ratings of the Professor.....49
11. Mean Ratings of the Professor.....50
12. Mean Ratings for Male and Female Professors.....53

I. Introduction

Assertiveness is defined by Rich and Schroeder (1976) as a set of interpersonal skills designed to maximize reinforcement in a social context. These skills include the expression of feelings, opinions or desires, for example, in making requests or giving compliments (Rathus, 1975). Assertiveness is also considered a general problem solving technique. For example, assertiveness training has been employed by O'Neil and Roitzsch (1977) in the treatment of alcohol abusers. Assertive behavior must be clearly distinguished from aggressive and nonassertive behavior. Hollandsworth (1977) defines aggressive behavior as behavior involving coercion. Similarly, Alberti and Emmons (1970) describe aggressive responses as including the delivery of noxious stimulation to another. For example, the use of threats to resolve interpersonal conflict is considered an aggressive response. Assertive behavior does not involve coercion but does involve the direct expression of one's feelings, needs or preferences. Failure to express one's feelings or opinions in a social situation describes the passive or nonassertive individual's behavior.

Assertion training strives to teach assertive skills and increase the frequency of assertive behavior. Assertion training for women is currently receiving extensive coverage in the popular press (Landau, 1976). Publications such as The Assertive Woman, (Phelps and Austin, 1975), The New Assertive Woman, (Bloom, Coburn, and Pearlman, 1975),

Assertive Training for Women ,(Osborn and Harris, 1975) and Self-Assertion for Women, (Butler, 1976) appear among an increasing number of books on assertiveness. The designation of women as a target group reflects the stereotypic conception of women as submissive, or nonassertive. It is assumed that women require training in assertive skills which have been previously omitted from their socialization (Jakubowski-Spector, 1973).

Allegations regarding the effectiveness of assertion training in increasing assertive behavior have been advanced by assertion training advocates. For example, Lazarus (1966) found that direct behavioral training in assertiveness was more effective in dealing with interpersonal problems than nondirective therapy or merely the giving of advice. The effectiveness of assertion training for women has recently been investigated by Wolfe and Fodor (1977). They reported a significant increase in assertive behavior immediately following assertion training as compared to a control group. That is, trainees showed an increased ability to make refusals, express negative feelings and initiate social contact.

Assessment of the effects of assertion training is, at the present time, fraught with methodological problems. For example, pre-and post-training differences in assertive behavior are commonly measured by some form of self-report (Rich and Schroeder, 1977). However, the validity of such methods has been questioned by Kwiterovich and Horan (1977)

who discovered a self-reported improvement in assertiveness following training but found no measurable differences using an assertiveness scale and an action situation inventory.

Another limitation in assessing the effects of assertiveness training is the scarcity of follow-up studies. Heimberg, Montgomery, Madsen, and Heimberg (1977) report that of the studies they revieved, 55% had no follow-up, and an additional 26% had a follow-up of one month or less. Therefore, it is difficult to make any statement as to the long term effects of assertion training at this time.

A third limitation of the assessment of assertion training effects is the lack of information concerning the impact of training on the social milieu of the trainees. Eisler, Miller, Hersen and Alford (1974) recognized the importance of the spouse in evaluating an assertion training program. They used pre- and post-training videotapes to record marital interactions of male alcoholic patients and their wives. The assertion training consisted of teaching the patients to increase specific assertive behaviors such as increasing eye contact. Trainees were also instructed in ways of requesting behavior change from their wives. Results of the program indicated an increase in the specified assertive behaviors by the husband. The wife was given no instruction but in the post-training videotape was shown to make fewer requests for behavior change of her husband. Couples reported greater satisfaction with the post-training conversations. No follow-up study ensued to indicate

generalization or maintenance of the assertive skills.

Subjects in the Eisler et al (1974) study were described as passive male patients. Thus teaching assertive skills to males was, in effect, directing their behavior toward the appropriate social stereotype. Such behavior was positively reinforced by the spouse who decreased the number of requests for behavior change.

Assertion training for women directs their behavior away from the appropriate social stereotype. Therefore assertive behavior may not be positively reinforced by the spouse or other members of her social network. The only study to date assessing the effects of women's assertion training on their husbands is a study by Muchowski and Valle (1977). Following a 4-week training course, female trainees reported an increase in assertive behavior. However, trainees and their spouses both reported positive and negative effects of the training on their relationship. Muchowski and Valle concluded that the spouse should be included in some phase of the training. The effects on other members of the trainees' social network (for example friends and coworkers) have not been reported. Furthermore the social desirability of assertiveness in women has not as yet been evaluated (Heimberg et al, 1977).

It is quite possible that the effects of assertion training on women may be difficult to maintain over a lengthy period because their social networks do not support, or reinforce assertive behavior in females. For example,

Bloom, Coburn and Pearlman (1975) claim that women are rewarded for nonassertive behavior. Furthermore, a failure to conform to the nonassertive feminine stereotype may result in social rejection (Wolfe and Fodor, 1975). Indeed, Chessler (1973) claims that assertive or aggressive behavior is considered pathological in women. Although such a statement appears extreme, Broverman, Broverman, Clarkson, Rosenkranz and Vogel (1970) demonstrated a double standard in clinical judgments of mental health for males and females: Women were judged mentally healthy by being more submissive and less aggressive than mentally healthy men. In other words, conformity to the social stereotype is indicative of "psychological" adjustment. Thus women behaving assertively may be perceived as violators of the social stereotype. Consequently, such violations may result in the loss of social reinforcement or in punishment conveyed by those who interact with the assertive woman. Continuation of these traditional stereotypes may hinder the development and maintenance of assertive skills.

A. Perceptions of Aggressive Women

An assessment of social consequences for sex-role stereotype violation was undertaken by Costrich, Feinstein, Kidder, Marecek and Pascles (1975). The authors hypothesized that female achievers may be perceived as "aggressive women" and consequently penalized for their deviant behavior. They

devised a series of experiments comparing reactions to males and females acting in either a passive or aggressive manner.

The first experiment utilized a male and female confederate to portray aggressive or passive behavior to a group of male and female subjects. Aggressive behavior was characterized by disagreement with group decisions and by attempts to control the group by making alternative suggestions. Passive behavior was characterized by complete agreement with group decisions. Each member of the group was asked to rate the other members on a number of bipolar adjective scales. Results of the study indicate that male subjects tend to administer negative evaluations for violation of stereotypic roles of both male and female violators. Specifically, the passive male and the aggressive female were rated as less popular than the aggressive male and the passive female. However, female subjects did not show this tendency. Thus the authors concluded that men may react more strongly than women to sex-role violations.

In the second experiment, Costrich et al utilized audiotapes of a male and a female confederate. The scripts were based on a conversation between a counsellor and a student. The passive script focussed on the student's feelings of inadequacy. The aggressive script focussed on an inadequate course instructor. The same male and female confederate read the role of the student in both the aggressive and passive form of the script. After listening to the tapes, subjects rated the students on a series of

bipolar adjective scales. In addition, subjects were asked to indicate whether or not they thought the student required psychotherapy. The aggressive female student was rated as requiring more psychotherapy than the passive female student. In like manner the passive male student was rated as requiring more psychotherapy than the aggressive male student. Unfortunately, information regardng the sex of the subjects was not collected, so differences in their ratings could not be attributed to this particular factor.

The third experiment required subjects to read a number of patient-therapist vignettes including an overtly aggressive patient vignette and a passive, dependent patient vignette. Again the number of male and female participants was not reported nor was information regarding subject sex differences in reactions to these vignettes. Nevertheless ratings by subjects indicated that aggressive female patients and passive male patients were liked less than passive female and aggressive male patients.

B. Rationale of the Present Study

The major purpose of the Costrich et al study (1975) was to assess the consequences of female aggressive behavior. A similar assessment of the consequences of assertive behavior has not as yet been made. The purpose of the present study was to attempt such an assessment and address a number of questions arising from the previous

research. For example, Costrich et al assumed that aggression and assertion described similar forms of behavior. Yet the proponents of assertion training claim that these are two distinct behavioral styles. Therefore, the present investigation examined the ability of subjects to distinguish between aggressive and assertive behavior. Similar perceptions of aggressive and assertive behavior would suggest that the same negative consequences encountered by aggressive women in the Costrich et al study would also be encountered by assertive women.

Results of the first Costrich et al (1975) experiment indicated that males in particular tended to rate aggressive females and passive males as less popular than non-violators of the traditional stereotypes. Unfortunately, these results were not examined in the subsequent experiments. The present study attempted to replicate this finding. Thus it was expected that male subjects in particular would give more negative ratings to aggressive females and passive males than their sterotypic counterparts. Furthermore, it was suggested that assertive females would receive the same evaluations as aggressive females.

Costrich et al were aware of the individual differences of the confederates and suggested that the subject's ratings may be influenced by the acting ability of the confederates. They attempted to control for this in the third experiment by using written vignettes. However, the ratings of written vignettes may not accurately reflect subjects' perceptions

of aggressive or passive behavior. The current study attempted to control for such idiosyncrasies by having two males and two females read each role. Therefore, it was anticipated that the ratings of both aggressive females and both passive males would imitate the Costrich et al (1975) finding. In addition both females in the assertive role would be expected to receive similar ratings as the aggressive female roles. Thus differences on the basis of the sex of the stimulus person could be more clearly demonstrated.

The current study also examined three factors which were not considered in any of the Costrich et al experiments. One factor was the sex of the participant listener. For example, both a male and a female confederate played the role of the student in the Costrich et al study, however, the sex of the counsellor was not mentioned. Subjects listening to the recorded conversations would, of course, be aware of the sex of the counsellor. Thus the perception of the confederate may be influenced by the behavioral manipulation, aggressive or passive, but within the context of an interaction with either a male or female counsellor.

The sex of the participant listener was believed to be an important variable since the same stereotypes could be expected to operate on all individuals within the stimulus condition. That is to say, male listeners may be perceived as more dominant than female listeners. Likewise, female

listeners may be perceived as more submissive than male listeners. The perception of the male or female listener may, in turn, influence the subject's perception of the target person.

Since the sex of the participant listener was not considered in the Costrich et al study, it seemed reasonable to investigate this effect. Thus a condition was devised in which males and females portrayed the aggressive, assertive and passive roles with a female as well as a male participant listener. It was expected that the perceptions of the male and female target persons would vary with the sex of the participant listener such that the aggressive male and female would appear more aggressive when interacting with a female listener than with a male listener. Similarly, a passive individual may be perceived as more submissive when interacting with a male listener than with a female listener. Thus it would appear that the sex of the person with whom the passive, aggressive, or assertive individual is interacting may enhance the behavioral manipulation in some cases by a contrast effect, namely, the contrast of aggressive behavior with a passive, submissive recipient and a similar contrast of passive behavior with a dominant recipient.

Comparing the effects of the listeners' sex on the perception of the target person gave rise to further speculation that a contrast effect may also influence the perception of the participant listener. For example, an

individual interacting with an aggressive target may be perceived as more submissive than when interacting with a passive target person. A person interacting with a passive target may be perceived as more aggressive than the same behavior contrasted with an aggressive target person. Thus the current study examined the subjects perceptions of the participant listener. In this manner, it would be possible to determine if the behavior of the target person influences the perception of the listener on other factors such as popularity, competence and sincerity. The social consequences of aggressive, assertive or passive behavior can not be fully evaluated without considering such situational variables.

The Costrich et al study does not consider these participant listener effects. For example, two different conversations were used to represent the aggressive and passive behavior styles in their second experiment. That is, the content of the conversation for the target person and listener varied with the behavioral style. Although subjects were asked to rate the behavior of the target person, they could easily have been responding to the two different situations presented. This strongly suggests that the perceptions of the target may be confounded by the nature of the interaction.

To avoid a similar confound, the present study did not vary the verbal content of the listener's role. That is, for each passive, aggressive and assertive script the responses

of the listener were kept exactly the same. In this manner, any variation in the perception of the target person could be attributed solely to the behavioral style of that target person and not to the nature of the interaction.

A third factor not considered by Costrich et al pertains to the subjects making the ratings. Certain characteristics of the rater may influence his/her perception of aggressive, assertive or passive behavior in males and females. The importance of the sex of the subject, for example, has already been mentioned. Another characteristic of the subject which may influence his or her perception of the target person is the degree to which the subjects perceive themselves as adhering to the expected sex-role stereotypes. For example, an aggressive female would not be expected to rate another aggressive female negatively. Similarly, passive males would be unlikely to give negative evaluations to other passive males. Assertive women may perceive other assertive women as not deviating from the norm and therefore not evaluate them negatively. Thus some measure of the degree to which an individual conforms to the sex-role stereotype seemed warranted.

Such a measure, the androgyny scale, has been devised by Bem (1974). The androgyny scale measures the degree to which individuals rate themselves as being masculine, feminine or androgynous. Masculine individuals describe themselves as conforming to the traditional stereotpyes, that is, as characterized by traditionally masculine traits.

Feminine individuals conform to the traditional female sex-role stereotype. Subjects who describe themselves as having only masculine or feminine characteristics are considered to be sex-typed. Androgynous individuals do not describe themselves as conforming to either sex-role stereotype but rather as having both feminine and masculine characteristics. Androgyny is, therefore, a combination of characteristics traditionally dichotomized as masculine and feminine. The present study examined the relationship between androgyny and the perception of males and females presenting assertive, aggressive and passive behavior. It was expected that individuals who are androgynous would not evaluate sex-role deviations with the same polarity as a sex-typed individual. For example, a sex-typed individual may rate a passive male more negatively than would an androgynous individual. Similarly, an aggressive or an assertive female would also be expected to receive more negative ratings from a sex-typed individual than from an androgynous individual.

In summary, the present study attempted to investigate how males and females would evaluate passive, aggressive and assertive behavior observed in members of their own or the opposite sex. On the basis of the Costrich et al findings, it was expected that male subjects would tend to give more negative evaluations for norm violation than females. Furthermore it was expected that assertive females would be evaluated in the same manner as aggressive females. In

addition, the study attempted to determine how males and females would evaluate the listener or recipients of such passive, assertive or aggressive behavior. It was suggested that the listener would be perceived as more aggressive when interacting with a passive target person than with an aggressive target person. Further it was suggested that the listener would be perceived as more passive when interacting with an assertive target person than with a passive target person. These different perceptions may be due to a contrast effect which could then be expected to influence other ratings of the participant listener. The sex of the listener was also mentioned as a possible determinant of the manner in which the target person is perceived. Hence, an assertive target may be perceived as more aggressive when interacting with a female listener than with a male listener.

Finally the study examined the effect of the subjects' androgyny score on the perception of males and females behaving in an aggressive, passive and assertive manner. It was predicted that androgynous persons would give fewer negative evaluations for aggressive or assertive women and passive men than sex-typed persons.

II. The Pilot Study

A. Overview

The first and most crucial step of the present research was to create interactions which would clearly portray passive, assertive or aggressive behaviors to subjects. In order to create such interactions, four different scripts were written, each describing a conversation between two people: (1) the target person, T, whose conversational behavior and style was varied (passive, aggressive or assertive) in three different versions of each script; (2) the listener, L, whose responses to T were held constant across the three different versions of each script. The primary purpose of the Pilot Study was to determine which, if any, of the four scripts could induce appropriate subject perceptions of passive, aggressive and assertive behavior vis a vis T; it was, in short, a test of the validity of the behavioral style manipulation.

Materials for the scripts were based on the definition and examples appearing in Bower and Bower (1976). To illustrate, Bower and Bower describe the passive individual as one who retreats from a situation and is likely to blame other people for his or her unhappiness. For example the passive scene described below is taken directly from Bower and Bower:

She: Uh, excuse me but I wonder if you would be willing to take the time to decide about the garden?

He: (looking at paper) Not now, I'm busy.

She: Oh, okay. (p 8)

The same scene in the aggressive behavioral style involves attacking the other person with intent to injure either psychologically or physically according to Bower and Bower:

She: Listen, I'm sick and tired of you putting off deciding about this damn garden. Are you going to help?

HE: (looking at paper) Not now, I'm busy.

She: Why can't you look at me when your're turning me down? You don't give a damn about the garden or the house or me. You just care about yourself. (p 9)

The assertive scene involves a move toward expressing feelings and clearly stating the behavior change requested.

She: It's spring and time to make plans for our garden.

He: (looking at paper) Oh, c'mon, not now. Its only April.

She: I feel that the garden is more enjoyable if we've planned it carefully together in advance. (p 10)

Once the four scripts were created for the pilot study, each having three versions, they were reviewed by three departmental colleagues. All three indicated that two of the scripts failed to give a distinctly different impression of

T across the three versions: the passive version, the aggressive version and the assertive version. One of these scripts focussed on a situation in which an individual, T, was being interviewed for a job by a potential employer, L. In this situation it was difficult to devise an aggressive script involving coercion or some other form of clearly aggressive verbal behavior. For example, it seemed unlikely that a job applicant would threaten his future employer in an attempt to facilitate his being hired. The other script focussed on an individual, L, returning an item to a store clerk, T. Again the nature of the situation did not allow for the development of a reasonably aggressive script. For example, the store clerk could express verbal aggression directed at the customer, however, such behavior is unlikely since the clerk's job frequently depends on customer satisfaction. Thus it would appear that certain situations are not amenable to aggressive manipulation.

Since the above two situations proved difficult to adapt to the three behavior styles, it was decided to omit them from the Pilot Study. However, the two remaining scripts were judged by three departmental colleagues and found to adequately differentiate between the three behavioral styles. One script, Script A, focussed on an interaction between a professor, L, and a student, T, concerning an exam grade (See appendix A for relevant scripts). The second script, Script B, focussed on an individual, T, asking a friend, L, for a favor which is the

use of his car (See Appendix B for relevant scripts). Not only did the scripts appear to distinguish between the behavioral styles but the two scripts represented two different types of situations. Script A was based on an achievement oriented situation and Script B was based on an interpersonal interaction.

III. Methods

A. Subjects

Forty-two Introductory Psychology students participated in the Pilot Study in partial fulfillment of a course requirement.

B. Apparatus and Materials

Stimulus Materials

Two scripts, A and B, were selected for audiotaping. Two females and two males read the role of T. They were instructed prior to the taping to read each script in the designated manner, that is, in an aggressive, assertive or passive behavioral style. In this way each version was enhanced by the intonations and inflections of the individuals portraying T.

Three series of tape recordings were produced. Series 1 used script A, the conversation between a student (T) and professor (L). The two males and two females playing the role of T, each read three versions of the script (aggressive, passive, assertive). Thus twelve different stimuli were created for Series 1. The part of L was portrayed in all twelve stimuli by the same male actor.

Series 2, using script B, was based on the conversation between two friends; a requesting friend (T) and the recipient friend (L). One male and one female recorded the

three versions of the script portraying the role of T. The recipient friend, L, was played by a male with exactly the same lines for all three versions. Therefore, 6 different stimuli were created to form Series 2.

The third series of tapes, Series 3, was based on script A, however, this time a female professor (L) interacted with student (T) concerning an exam grade. As in Series 1, two males and two females read the part of T for all three versions (aggressive, asertive, and passive). The part of the professor (L) was read by the same female for all versions. Thus twelve stimulus tapes were produced to form Series 3.

Four casette tape players with headphones were used to present the stimuli to the subjects.

Response Materials

A one page questionnaire was designed to record subject responses. (See Appendix C for the questionnaire). The questionnaire was divided into two parts. The first part consisted of 7 bipolar adjective scales similar to those used in the Costrich et al study. Items included ratings of T on Aggressive-Passive and Assertive-Nonassertive factors. Five filler items were also included in the adjective scales.

The second section of the response sheet asked subjects to indicate whether or not T's behavior was best described as aggressive, passive or assertive. In other words,

subjects were forced to select the appropriate descriptor. In summary, subject responses included adjectival ratings, and a forced choice question.

C. Procedure

Subjects were brought to the laboratory in pairs. For Series 1 and Series 3 subjects were randomly assigned to listen to three different versions; aggressive, passive, and assertive, as read by three different people. For example, a subject was assigned to listen to a male aggressive T, an assertive female T, and a passive female T. For Series 2, subjects were randomly assigned to listen to two different stimuli. For example, a subject was assigned to listen to a passive male T and an assertive female T. Subjects were instructed to listen carefully to each conversation and try to form an impression of T. Only the behavioral style of T was of interest for the purpose of the pilot study (Instructions to subjects are provided in Appendix D). After listening to the assigned conversation, subjects were asked to complete the questionnaire pertaining to that conversation. Following completion of the questionnaire subjects listened to the next assigned conversation. When all questionnaires were completed subjects were debriefed and thanked for their cooperation.

IV. Results

A. Series 1.

Each subject listened to three different versions of the tape; passive, aggressive and assertive, and completed the same questionnaire for each version. Therefore, a treatment by subjects analysis of variance was used to determine the effectiveness of the different versions of the script. Means and standard deviations for the Assertive-Nonassertive ratings and the Aggressive-Passive ratings of T are reported in Table 1. Ratings of T differed significantly with respect to assertion (F=64.11; d.f.=2,22; p<.001) and aggression (F=62.74; d.f.= 2,22; p<.001). It appears that subjects were, indeed, able to distinguish between the three behavioral styles of T as represented in the Series 1 tapes.

As a further check of the manipulation, the proportion of agreements in the forced choice question was determined. An agreement was taken to be a response which concurred with the assigned label of the version. For example, a version which was labelled aggressive by the experimenter and which was designated aggressive by the subject was considered to be an agreement. Table 2 illustrates the distribution of choices for each version. The proportion of choices in agreement with the assigned label was .83. A chance proportion of actual agreements was assumed to be .33. In this way, a significance of the proportion of actual

Table 1

Mean Ratings of The Target Person

Behavioral Style	n[a]	Rating Scale: aggressive	Rating Scale: unassertive
Series 1			
passive	12	2.17	5.83
assertive	12	5.08	2.67
aggressive	12	6.58	1.33
Series 2			
passive	8	4.25	4.37
assertive	10	5.00	2.82
aggressive	6	5.83	1.2
Series 3			
passive	18	2.38	5.33
assertive	18	5.11	2.83
aggressive	18	6.5	2.11

n[a] indicates number of subjects listening to each tape.

NOTE: Maximum score = 7

Table 2

Judgments of the Target Person's Behavioral Style

Defined Role of the Target Person	Subjects' Judgment		
	passive	assertive	aggressive
Series 1			
passive	11	1	0
assertive	0	10	2
aggressive	0	2	10
Series 2			
passive	3	0	6
assertive	2	5	3
aggressive	0	3	4
Series 3			
passive	14	3	1
assertive	2	10	6
aggressive	0	8	10

agreements could be calculated. A significant proportion of choices did, in fact, agree with the assigned label of passive, aggressive or assertive behavioral style (z=3.19; p<.01). Thus, it was concluded that subjects could distinguish between the three versions of the Series 1 tapes.

B. Series 2

Because Series 2 subjects listened to only two versions, a 1 X 3, between subjects analysis of variance with unequal N's was performed on the rating scale data. Means and standard deviations for the Assertive-Nonassertive and the Aggressive-Passive scales are reported in Table 1. Ratings of aggression for T did not differ significantly across the three versions (F=1.09; d.f.=2,21; p< .20). However, ratings of assertion did differ across versions (F=12.65; d.f.=2,21; p< .001). It appears that the behavioral style of T was not clearly differentiated in the Series 2 tapes.

Additional analysis of the forced choice question supports this assumption. The distribution of choices for Series 2 is illustrated in Table 2. The proportion of agreements was .50, which is not significant (z=1.77; p>.05). Therefore, it was concluded that the Series 2 tapes do not seem to be effective in representing the three behavioral styles.

C. Series 3

As in Series 1 a treatment by subjects analysis of variance was performed on the rating scale data. Means and standard deviations for the Assertive-Nonassertive and Passive-Aggressive scales are reported in Table 1. Aggression ratings for T differed significantly across the three versions ($F=7.98$; d.f.= 2,34; $p<.001$), as did the ratings of assertion ($F=15.66$; d.f.=2,34; $p<.001$). The results indicate that subjects can distinguish between the three behavioral styles for the Series 3 tapes.

Additional support for these findings was provided by the forced choice question. The distribution of choices for Series 3 appears in Table 2. The proportion of agreements was .63, which is a significant proportion ($z=2.56$; $p<.01$). Therefore, it can be concluded that the Series 3 tapes adequately portray the three behavioral styles.

V. Discussion

The results support the validity of the aggressive, assertive and passive behavioral manipulation as represented in the Series 1 and Series 3 tapes. Subjects distinguished between the three behavioral styles of T for the two series. Both series were based on a conversation between a student and a professor. In one series, Series 1, the professor was male and in the second series, Series 3, the professor was female. In all other respects, the tapes were the same. Subjects did not accurately distinguish between the three behavioral styles of T for one series of tapes, Series 2. In this case the topic of conversation centered around a friend making a request of another friend.

The most important finding concerns the accurate perception of T in the Series 1 and 3 tapes. Perhaps more interesting, however, is the finding that the Series 2 tapes were not perceived as representing the different behavioral styles. One possible reason for this was a failure of the script to include sufficient phrases and expressions to clarify the style being presented. Although analysis did not reveal as significant an effect as discovered in Series 1 and 3, nevertheless, the results were in the expected direction. In fact, the ratings on the assertion scale were significant across the three versions.

Another possible reason for the failure of subjects to discriminate between the three behaviorial styles in the Series 2 tapes is the individual differences in style of

delivery for the male and female T. However, the same male and female in the role of T are also found in the Series 1 and 3 tapes which did show significant differences. Idiosycrasies, as a possible explanation for the Series 2 results, is less cogent although it cannot be completely ruled out at this time.

A more plausible explanation of the failure to distinguish the three behavioral styles in Series 2 concerns certain aspects of the situation in which they were presented. For example, in Series 1 a female student addresses a male professor. This is not an unusual or unexpected occurrence in a University setting. In the Series 2 tapes, however, a female initiates a phone call to a male and proceeds to make a request. This situation involves behavior by a female which strongly deviates from the traditional feminine role. Thus the female character represented in the tapes may be labelled aggressive as a function of the situation alone, rather than as a function of her behavioral style.

A closer examination of the data suggests that the female in this particular situation was perceived as more aggressive than the male although the scripts were identical. For example, in the forced choice question, 75% of the responses indicated subjects perceived the female's behavior as aggressive. The other 25% of the responses described the female as being assertive. No passive ratings were given. In contrast, the male's behavior was perceived

as aggressive for only 18% of the responses; assertive 45% and passive 27%. Therefore, the perception of the female and male in the Series 2 tapes appear to differ and may account for the failure of subjects to distinguish between the three behavioral styles presented.

Another aspect of the situation which may have contributed to the failure of Series 2 is related to the perceived motivation of the target person, T. For example, in Series 1 and 3 the situation is one concerning achievement. Costrich et al hypothesized that female achievers are perceived as being aggressive or assertive. Therefore, the aggressive or assertive behavior of the female in an achievement situation, such as the student asking for a higher grade, may be perceived as being appropriate to some extent. Similar behavior in other situations, however, may be perceived as inappropriate. For example, in the Series 2 tapes, the conversation centers on an interpersonal relationship, between two friends. It may be that aggressive behavior is perceived as inadvisable in an interpersonal situation. Therefore the extreme aggressive ratings of the female in the nonachievment situation may reflect this perception.

Since only two of the taped series could clearly be distinguished as representing aggressive, passive, and assertive behavioral styles, only Series 1 and Series 3 were included as stimulus materials in the main study.

VI. The Main Study

A. Overview

The purpose of the main study was to address the questions arising from the Costrich et al (1975) research as outlined in the introduction. The major focus was the perception of a target person (T) conveying a passive, assertive or aggressive behavioral style. Specifically, the perception of aggressive and assertive women and passive men was of interest. In addition, the sex of the listener (L) was examined as a possible factor in the perception of males and females in the passive, aggressive, and assertive roles. Furthermore, the perception of the listener was scrutinized for a contrast effect arising from the varying behavioral styles of the target person. Finally, the relationship between the degree of androgyny for subjects was investigated as a possible determinant of the way the target person was perceived.

Results of the pilot study indicated that only two series of tapes adequately distinguished between the three behavioral styles, so only these (Series 1 and Series 3) were employed in the main study . Recall that the conversation was between a student (T) and a professor (L) concerning an exam grade. Thus the situation represented is achievement oriented. The role of the student was presented in three forms; passive, aggressive and assertive, with two males and two females enlisted to play the role of the

student. The role of the professor was played by a male in Series 1 and a female in Series 3.

VII. Method

A. Subjects

Forty-eight female and 48 male introductory psychology students participated in this experiment in partial fulfillment of a course requirement.

B. Stimulus Materials

Series 1 and Series 3 tapes as described in the pilot study were employed in the main study. Each series consisted of twelve different interactions between a student and a professor. Only the sex of the professor varied in the two series.

Tapes were presented on four individual cassette tape recorders with headphones.

C. Response Materials

A questionnaire was designed to record subject responses (See Appendix E). Subjects were asked to rate the student (T) on a list of bipolar adjective rating scales similar to the one utilized in the pilot study. In this case, however, an expanded list of 14 bipolar adjectives was used to indicate the subject's perception of the student.

Items included the aggressive-passive scale and the assertive-nonassertive scale. The remaining scales, such as popular-unpopular and dominant-submissive were included to provide a more extensive evaluation of the student by the subject. Subjects were required to rate the student on all fourteen scales.

As an ancillary means of assessing subjects' perception of the student, a judgment question was also included in the questionnaire. This item is analogous to the question contained in the Costrich et al research requiring subjects to decide whether or not the target person required psychotherapy. Since the topic of the conversation in the present study concerned an exam grade, subjects were asked whether or not they would raise the student's grade.

The subjects' perception of the professor (L) was assessed by means of a list of bipolar adjective rating scales. The same scales, employed to evaluate the student, were also employed to evaluate the professor. Subjects were asked to rate the professor on all fourteen items.

The last part of the questionnaire contained 30 items selected from the Bem androgyny scale; 10 masculine, 10 feminine, and 10 neutral items. Subjects were asked to decide if a certain item was descriptive of themselves on a scale ranging from "always" to "never". The Bem scale was employed in order to measure the degree to which subjects described themselves as endorsing the traditional sex-role stereotype. In this manner the relation of the degree of

androgyny to the perception of males and females differing in behavioral style could be determined.

D. Procedure

Subjects were brought to the laboratory in groups of four. Each subject was randomly assigned to one of the 24 conditions, and listened to only one conversation. A subject was assigned to listen to either a male professor or a female professor interacting with either a male student or a female student; the student's role being either aggressive, assertive, or passive. For example, a subject was assigned to listen to a female professor interacting with a passive male student.

The same instructions were used as in the pilot study (See Appendix D). After listening to the assigned conversation subjects were asked to complete the questionnaire. Following the completion of the questionnaire subjects were debriefed and thanked for their cooperation.

VIII. Results

Of major interest was the bipolar adjective ratings of the student. A 2 x 2 x 2 x 2 x 3 (sex of subject x sex of student x sex of professor x actor x behavioral style) analysis of variance was performed on the ratings for each scale. A summary of significant main effects and interactions is presented in Table 3. Intercorrelations between the scales were obtained to determine the relationship of the ratings to each other. A summary of the significant correlations are reported in Table 4 for both the male and female student.

A. Effectiveness of the Manipulation

As reported in Table 3 a main effect of behavioral style was found to be significant for thirteen out of the fourteen rating scales. Means for this main effect are presented in Table 5. Of particular importance was the effect of the three behavioral styles on ratings of aggressive-passive (F=57.42; d.f.=2,47; $p<.001$) and Assertive-Nonassertive (F=29.82; d.f.=2,47; $p<.001$). Judging from Table 5, the means for aggression ratings increased across the three behavioral styles. That is, the passive individual was rated less aggressive than the assertive or the aggressive individual. Similarly, ratings of nonassertiveness decreased across the three behavioral styles such that aggressive and assertive individuals were

Table 3

Summary of Significant Analysis of Variance Results for Ratings of the Student

Source	Scale													
	unfriendly	outspoken	insincere	aggressive	competent	calm	unassertive	rude	unpopular	timid	unsure	retiring	dominant	dishonest
Sex of Student (T)									X					
Behavioral Style (B)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
Sex of Subject (S)														
Bx Sex of Professor (P)			X		X									
Px Sex of Student (T)					X									
Tx Actor (A)					X									
TxP							X							
BxSxP								X						
BxSxA							X		X					
TxSxA	X									X				
TxPxA		X												
BxPxSxA			X											

Note: X indicates significance at .05 level and higher

Table 4

Significant Correlations for Ratings of Male and Female Students[1]

Scale	unfriendly	outspoken	insincere	aggressive	competent	calm	unassertive	rude	unpopular	timid	unsure	retiring	dominant	dishonest
unfriendly		.52		.48				.71	.31	-.52			.44	
outspoken	.44			.85		-.61	.70			-.87	-.65	-.70	-.80	
insincere	.31			-.35										.40
aggressive	.39	.68			.41	-.55	.61			-.81	-.68	-.59	.81	
competent	-.45	-.29								-.33	-.42	-.36	.35	-.53
calm		.32		.31	.44					-.36				
unassertive	-.30	-.62		-.69	-.34		-.32			.69	.62	.53	-.60	
rude	.72	.61	.55	.52	-.42	-.30			.30	-.57	-.34	-.35	.59	.35
unpopular														
timid	-.36	-.82		-.79	-.41	.61	-.55				.76	.72	-.81	
unsure		-.67		-.66	-.68	.58	-.30			.80		.75	-.81	
retiring	-.35	-.74		-.63		.49	-.38			.76	.62		-.74	
dominant	.44	.74		.79		-.55	.61			-.73	-.61	-.62		
dishonest	.40	.38	.70	-.29			.57					-.29	.40	

NOTE: Correlations reported are significant at .05 level or higher

[1] Female scores are reported above the diagonal

Male scores are reported below the diagonal

Table 5

Mean Ratings of the Student

Scale	Behavioral Style		
	passive	assertive	aggressive
unfriendly	3.03	3.50	5.44
outspoken	2.88	5.82	6.47
insincere	3.12	2.82	3.90
aggressive	2.88	5.44	6.25
competent	3.87	5.16	4.06
calm	2.97	5.09	3.50
unassertive	4.72	2.45	2.31
rude	1.87	2.56	6.03
unpopular	4.28	4.06	4.65
timid	5.40	2.12	1.72
unsure	5.16	2.19	2.19
retiring	4.84	2.86	2.90
dominant	3.06	5.50	6.09
dishonest	3.28	2.78	4.06

rated as more assertive than passive individuals. Since the stimuli were designed to elicit just such differences, these findings would seem to verify the effectiveness of the manipulation. In other words, subjects distinguished between aggressive, assertive and passive behavioral styles as presented in the stimulus tapes.

B. Evaluation of the Student

Popularity

Based on the Costrich et al study it was predicted that aggressive and assertive females, and passive males, would be rated as less popular than passive females and aggressive-assertive males. Therefore, a student sex by behavioral style interaction was expected on ratings of popularity. However, the present study failed to produce a significant interaction (F=.3966; d.f.=2,47; p>.20).

A significant interaction was also predicted from the results of the Costrich study for the effect of sex of subject x sex of student x behavioral style on ratings of popularity. Recall that males were expected to rate passive males and aggressive females as less popular than their stereotypic counterparts. Again this finding was not replicated in the present study (F= 1.222; d.f.=2,47; p>.20).

As illustrated in Table 3 a significant main effect of student sex emerged for ratings of popularity (F=4.64; d.f.= 1,47; p< .05). The means for this effect are 4.10 for males

and 4.57 for females. Thus females were rated more popular than males.

In support of their findings that passive males are rated as less popular than aggressive males, Costrich et al reported a strong positive correlation between ratings of dominance and popularity for males but not for females. Table 4 indicates that in the present study popularity scores were not shown to correlate significantly with the dominance ratings for males ($r=.05$; $p>.20$). In fact, popularity ratings did not correlate with any of the other ratings for males. Popularity did show a small but significant correlation with friendliness ($r=.31$; $p<.05$) and politeness ($r=.30$; $p<.05$) for females.

Competence

To determine if passive males, and aggressive or assertive females, were rated differently from their stereotypic counterparts, all remaining rating scales were examined for a significant sex of student by behavioral style interaction. The only rating scale demonstrating this interaction was the ratings of competence ($F=4.25$; d.f.=2,48; $p<.05$). Judging from the means reported in Table 6, aggressive and assertive females were rated as more competent than passive females. Assertive males were rated as more competent than passive and aggressive males.

Since aggressive and assertive behavioral styles appeared to be an important factor in ratings of competence,

Table 6

Mean Ratings of Male and Female Students

	Behavioral Style					
	passive		assertive		aggressive	
Scale	male	female	male	female	male	female
unfriendly	3.13	2.94	3.25	3.75	5.44	5.44
outspoken	2.75	3.00	5.38	6.25	6.25	6.68
insincere	2.81	3.43	2.50	3.13	4.13	3.69
aggressive	2.88	2.88	5.19	5.69	6.00	6.50
competent	3.94	3.81	5.50	4.81	3.56	4.56
calm	2.38	3.56	5.13	5.06	3.43	3.56
unassertive	4.50	4.94	2.53	2.37	2.19	2.43
rude	1.62	2.13	2.31	2.81	6.00	6.06
unpopular	4.19	4.37	3.75	4.40	4.37	4.93
timid	5.38	5.44	2.25	2.00	1.81	1.63
unsure	5.38	4.94	2.19	2.19	2.50	1.88
retiring	4.75	4.94	3.06	2.69	2.88	2.94
dominant	2.88	3.25	5.25	5.75	6.13	6.06
dishonest	2.81	3.75	2.56	3.00	4.13	4.00

NOTE: Maximum score = 7

the correlations of these variables were examined. As indicated in Table 4, ratings of competence did correlate significantly with ratings of aggression for female students (r=.41; p<.05) but not with ratings of assertiveness (r=.23; p>.10). Ratings of aggression and assertion for males did not correlate significantly with ratings of competence (r=.04; p>.20) and (r=.04; p>.20) respectively.

Judgments of the Students

Results of the judgment question were analysed to provide further assessment of subjects' perception of males and females portraying the three behavioral styles. On the basis of the Costrich study, a significant relationship was predicted between judgments and behavioral style. Recall that passive males and aggressive females were judged more frequently to be in need of psychotherapy than aggressive males and passive females. A chi-square was used to test for the existence of a relationship between behavioral style and the type of response to the question (yes or no). Frequencies of the responses are reported in Table 7 . The judgments were not related to the behavioral style for females (X^2=1.32; d.f.=2; p>.50) or for males (X^2=3.28; d.f.=2; p>.10). In the present study there is no significant evidence for an association between behavioral style and the responses to the judgment question.

Table 7

Responses to the Judgment Question

Would you raise the student's grade?

Sex of Student	Yes	No
Male		
passive	5	11
assertive	3	13
aggressive	1	15
Female		
passive	1	15
assertive	3	12
aggressive	2	14

Effect of the Sex of the Professor on Ratings of the Student

Since it was predicted that the sex of the professor would influence the perception of the aggressive, passive or assertive student, ratings of the students were examined for a significant sex of professor by behavioral style interaction. A significant interaction did appear in ratings of sincere-insincere ($F=3.53$; d.f.=2,48; $p<.05$) and competent-incompetent ($F=4.263$; d.f.=2,48; $p<.05$) but not for ratings of aggression or assertion. Means for the significant results are reported in Table 8. From these results, it appears that assertive students interacting with a male professor were perceived as more competent than students interacting with a female professor. Assertive students interacting with a male professor were also rated as more sincere than when interacting with a female professor. Furthermore, aggressive students interacting with a male professor were rated as less sincere than when interacting with a female professor.

The effect of the professor's sex was expected to influence the ratings of passive males, and aggressive and assertive females. Therefore, ratings were examined for a sex of student by sex of professor by behavioral style interaction. No such interaction emerged from the data. As indicated in Table 3, a significant sex of professor by sex of student interaction did occur on ratings of assertiveness ($F=8.242$; d.f.=1,47; $p<.01$). The means for the male professor are 3.43 for male students and 2.79 for female

Table 8

Mean Competence and Sincerity Ratings for Students Interacting with a Male and a Female Professor

Sex of the Professor	Rating Scale: Competent	Insineere
Male		
passive student	3.69	3.19
assertive student	5.50	2.43
aggressive student	3.63	4.44
Female		
passive student	4.06	3.06
assertive student	4.81	3.18
aggressive student	4.50	3.38

NOTE: maximum score = 7

students. Means for the female professor are 2.75 for male students and 3.71 for female students. Thus male students interacting with a male professor were rated as less assertive than male students interacting with a female professor. Similarly, female students interacting with a female professor were perceived as less assertive than with a male professor. In other words students interacting with the same sex professor were seen as less assertive than when interacting with an opposite sex professor.

Surprisingly, a significant sex of professor by behavioral style by sex of subject interaction emerged from the data on ratings of rudeness. The means in Table 9 indicate that male subjects rated assertive students interacting with a male professor as more rude than assertive students interacting with a female professor. On the other hand, female subjects rated assertive students interacting with a female professor as more rude than assertive students interacting with a male professor.

Idiosyncratic Effects

The remainder of significant results reported in Table 7 are related to the four different individuals enlisted to play the role of the student. Thus it appears that uncontrolled characteristics of the individuals portraying the different behavioral styles did effect the perception of the student. Therefore, these idiosyncratic effects place some constraints on the generality of the other significant

Table 9

Mean Rudeness Ratings of Students Interacting with a Male and a Female Professor by Male and Female Subjects

Sex of Professor		Subjects Sex: Male	Female
Male			
	passive student	1.50	2.37
	assertive student	2.75	2.25
	aggressive student	6.38	5.88
Female			
	passive student	2.00	1.63
	assertive student	1.87	3.25
	aggressive student	6.25	6.13

NOTE: Maximum score = 7

results reported above. Since these particular idiosyncratic interactions are beyond the focus of the present study further analysis of these results was not attempted.

C. Evaluation of the Professor

Since it was predicted that the varying behavioral styles of the student would influence the perception of the professor, the ratings of the professor were also subjected to a 2x2x2x2x3 analysis of variance. A summary of significant main effects and interactions are reported in Table 10. If subjects were being influenced by the proposed contrast effect, then it would be expected that the ratings of the professor on the aggression scale would vary with the different behavioral styles of the student. For example, the aggressive ratings of the professor should be higher with a passive student than with an assertive or aggressive student. In the same manner, the professor should be rated as less assertive with an aggressive or assertive student than with a passive student. Thus a significant main effect of behavioral style was expected for ratings of aggression and assertion. This main effect was significant for ratings of aggression ($F=7.44$; d.f.$=2,48$; $p<.01$) but not for assertion ($F=1.367$; d.f.$=2,46$; $p>.20$). The mean ratings as illustrated in Table 11 indicate that the professor was rated as most aggressive when interacting with a passive student.

Table 10

Summary of Significant Analysis of Variance Results for Ratings of the Professor

Source	Scale												
	unfriendly	outspoken	insincere	aggressive	competent	calm	unassertive	rude	unpopular	timid	unsure	retiring	dominant	dishonest
Sex of Professor (P)	X		X			X		X						
Sex of Student (T)												X		
Behavioral Style (B)		X		X						X			X	
PxT						X								
Tx Subject Sex (S)													X	
Bx Actor (A)						X				X	X		X	
BxPxS		X							X					
BxPxA						X								
SxPxT													X	
SxPxA												X		
BxTxSxA													X	
BxTxPxA								X						
BxTxPxS													X	
TxPxSxA			X											
BxTxSxPxA						X								

NOTE: X indicates significant at the .05 level or higher

Table 11

Mean Ratings of the Professor

Rating Scale	Behavioral Style of Student		
	passive	assertive	aggressive
aggressive	4.22	3.44	3.03
unassertive	2.91	3.37	3.37
dominant	5.47	4.58	4.31
timid	3.13	3.53	3.93
outspoken	4.63	3.53	3.25

NOTE: Maximum score = 7

Other ratings of the professor were examined for a contrast effect as exemplified by a behavioral style main effect. Recall that the professor's lines remained constant for all conditions, however, the varying behavior of the student was expected to produce a contrast effect, thereby altering the ratings of the professor. A significant effect was found for ratings of dominance, (F=12.25; d.f.=2,48; p<.001), timidity (F=4.04; d.f.=2,48; p<.05), and outspokenness (F=14.1; d.f.=2,48; p<.001). The means for these effects are reported in Table 11. Professors interacting with a passive student were rated as more dominant and outspoken than professors interacting with an aggressive student. Similarly professors interacting with an aggressive student were rated as more timid than when interacting with a passive student.

Subjects' ratings of the professor on the passive-aggressive scale were examined for possible associations with the remaining rating scales. Significant correlations for ratings of aggression were found for ratings of unfriendliness (r=.37; p<.001) rudeness (p.27; p<.001), and popularity (r=.19; p<.05).

Effect of the Professor's Sex on Professor's Ratings

Since a significant sex of student effect was found for certain ratings of the student, ratings of the professor were examined for a significant sex of professor effect. A significant sex of professor effect was found on five of the

fourteen scales: unfriendly-friendly, insincere-sincere, calm-nervous, rude-polite, unsure-sure. Inspection of the means in Table 12 indicates that the female professor was rated more favorably than the male professor on all variables listed except on ratings of unsure-sure. As demonstrated, gender seems to be an important factor in the subject's perception of the professor.

Idiosyncratic Effects

As in the student ratings a number of idiosyncratic effects emerged from the ratings of the professor as indicated in Table 10. Since these particular interactions are beyond the focus of the present study further analysis of these results was not attempted.

D. Androgyny Scores

Androgyny scores were calculated for each subject. A high score indicates a sex-typed individual while a low score indicates a non-sex-typed or androgynous individual. The score was derived from the absolute difference between the subject's self-ratings on the feminine items and the masculine items as presented in the Bem Androgyny Scale. Bem (1974) utilized a t-ratio for determining individual scores, however, she reported that the simple difference between masculine and feminine scores can be used as an index of androgyny since there is a strong correlation between the

Table 12

Mean Ratings for Male and Female Professors

	Sex of Professor	
Scale	Male	Female
unfriendly	3.35	2.39
insincere	3.31	2.39
calm	5.67	6.28
rude	2.77	1.73
unsure	2.83	3.19

NOTE: Maximum score = 7

t-ratio and the simple difference (r=.98). Since the two indices are empirically equivalent the simple index was used in the present study to calculate the androgyny score.

To determine if males and females differed in the degree to which they endorsed masculine or feminine characteristics, a t-test was performed on the mean difference of androgyny scores for males and females. There was no significant difference between the two means (t=.44; d.f.=94; p>.50).

It was predicted that individuals attaining high scores on the androgyny scale, that is, highly sex-typed individuals, would give more negative ratings to passive males, aggressive females and assertive females than to passive females, aggressive males and assertive males. To determine if androgyny scores were related to the ratings of stereotype deviants, Pearson Product-Moment Correlations were performed on the ratings of the student. No significant correlation was found between subjects' androgyny scores and ratings of sex role deviants (passive males, aggressive females and assertive females). Similarly, no significant correlation was found between subjects' androgyny scores and ratings of non-deviants(assertive males, aggressive males and passive females).

IX. Discussion

The present study examined the perception of passive, aggressive and assertive males and females. The male and female target persons portrayed a student in all three behavioral styles. The target person interacted with a participant listener, either a male or female professor. The interaction, in the form of an audiotaped conversation, was presented to subjects who were asked to rate both the target person, whose behavior varied, and the listener, whose behavior was held constant. In addition, subjects were asked to rate themselves on selected items from the Bem Androgyny Scale.

The results indicate that assertive behavior can be distinguished from passive and aggressive behavior. The ratings of the target person indicate that aggressive and assertive females, are perceived as more competent than passive females and that assertive males are also perceived as more competent than passive males. In addition, ratings of the target person were shown to be influenced by the sex of the participant listener. A contrast effect was demonstrated in the perception of the listener whose behavior was held constant across the varying behavior of the target person. It should be kept in mind that the generality of all significant results is limited by the appearance of idiosyncratic effects attributable to the individuals enlisted to protray the target person. Finally, the subjects' androgyny scores were not associated with the

ratings of aggressive and assertive females, nor with ratings of passive males.

A. Perception of the Target Person

The present study did not replicate the findings of the Costrich et al (1975) research. Male subjects did not rate passive males and aggressive females as less popular than aggressive males and passive females. Several explanations for this discrepancy between the Costrich results and those of the present study may be entertained. For example, the current findings may reflect differences in the populations used in the two studies. Since the original study, done four years ago, there has been much publicity concerning the changing social roles of men and women. Therefore, the traditional stereotypes may not be as strong now as would have been expected previously. Indeed, a more recent study by Kravetz (1976) indicated that female subjects no longer describe healthy men and women in terms of traditional sex-role stereotypes. Although this interpretation would be welcomed by feminists it is doubtful that sex-role stereotypes have been completely eradicated.

It seems more likely that the traditional stereotypes may still be operating in some situations but not in others. For example, interpersonal situations may still favor submissive, passive behavior for females and dominant, aggressive behavior for males. Achievement situations, on

the other hand, may warrant assertive or aggressive behavior in females and in males. Recall that in the pilot study women, who initiated contact with men, were considered aggressive regardless of their behavioral style. Furthermore, a recent study by Hall and Black (1979) indicated that attitudes toward women were less favorable following observation of aggressive behavior portrayed by a female. In their experiment, a confederate acting as a subject interacted with the experimenter in either an assertive or aggressive manner. Since this was a non-achievement situation it appears that the aggressive behavior by a female was perceived as inappropriate. Thus the results of the current pilot study and the Hall and Black experiment would seem to support the notion that sex-role stereotypes continue in certain non-achievement situations.

The importance of the situation in determining expected sex-role behavior can also be demonstrated from a further comparison of the current study with the Costrich et al research. Recall that Costrich et al employed a social situation (group discussion) and a clinical situation (counsellor-student interaction; patient-therapist vignettes). The situation in the present study is clearly achievement oriented, that is, a student desiring a higher grade in order to enter medical school. Students in this high achievement situation are expected to be assertive or aggressive if in fact they are to succeed. To illustrate,

several subjects commented that the passive female would never make it in medical school because she wasn't assertive enough. Subjects expressing these views may be more likely to give negative ratings to a passive female than to an assertive or aggressive female in this particular situation.

Another possible reason for the lack of agreement between the present study and the Costrich et al research is related to the dependent measures employed. The major dependent variable in the Costrich study reflected subjects' perceptions of the targets' popularity. Results of the present study suggest that "popularity" may not be an appropriate measure when the situation is achievement oriented rather than socially oriented. For example, the current research demonstrated that popularity ratings were not a function of behavioral style but rather a function of whether the target person was a male or female. Females were rated as more popular than males. Appropriate behavior in a social situation may be related to popularity, however, success in an achievement situation may not be related to popularity. For example, competence may be a more important factor in achievment than in a social situation. Thus the nature of the situation effects the criterion by which the raters perceive the target person.

Results of the present study indicate that passive males and females are perceived as less competent than aggressive and assertive females, and assertive males. Recall that the achievment situation employed involved an

aspiring medical student. Thus males and females were persuing a predominantly masculine profession. Spence and Helmreich (1972) demonstrated that competent women with masculine interests were liked more than incompetent women with masculine interests. In the present study, the professional aspirations of the women were stereotypically "masculine". Thus, aggressive and assertive behavior by these women may be perceived as necessary for success in such an endeavor. Therefore, aggressive and assertive women were viewed as more competent than passive women and may not receive the unpopular ratings as in the Costrich et al research.

The judgment question, introduced as an ancillary method of testing subject's perception of the target person, failed to indicate any differences for assertive, passive or aggressive males and females. The question, whether or not the subjects would raise the student's grade, received comments from several subjects following the debriefing. For example, a premed student said he disliked any student who approached a professor for a higher grade. It is likely that his response to the judgment question reflected this opinion. Other students commented that they tried to be as objective as possible in deciding whether or not the student deserved a higher grade and that not enough information for such an objective decision was contained in the conversation between the student and professor. In the Costrich et al study undergraduate subjects had no qualms about deciding

whether or not a student needed psychotherapy, however, in the current study students were reluctant to make a decision without more information. Perhaps this is because the situation of an exam grade is more salient to subjects who are themselves students.

To summarize, the perception of aggressive and assertive women, and passive men as sex-role deviants appears to be largely determined by the situation. Thus findings related to social sanctions for deviant behavior are difficult to generalize across situations.

B. Effects of the Sex of the Listener on the Perception of the Target

The sex of the listener (L) did not influence the perception of the target (T) on ratings of aggression or assertion. For example, an aggressive male student (T) was not perceived as more aggressive or assertive when interacting with a female professor (L). However, assertive students were perceived as more competent and sincere when interacting with a male professor than when interacting with a female professor. Although difficult to explain, these results may reflect traditional stereotypes as attributed to the professor. The female professor may be perceived as more nurturant and less competent than a male professor. By comparison the students interacting with a competent male professor may therefore appear more competent and sincere

than with a nurturant female professor.

Students interacting with an opposite sex professor were perceived as more assertive than students interacting with a same sex professor. The setting of the interaction implies a certain amount of assertive behavior. For example, a completely passive student would probably not even go to see the professor about an exam grade. However, the explanation for such a finding cannot be solely attributed to the nature of the situation. Perhaps subjects perceived that initiating social contact with an opposite sex professor (even in an achievement situation) was more assertive than initiating contact with a same sex professor.

C. Evaluation of the Listener

A contrast effect was demonstrated in the perception of the listener across the varying behavioral styles of the target. As the target's behavior changed from a passive role to an aggressive role, the listener's behavior was perceived as changing from aggressive, outspoken, bold, and dominant to passive, timid, quiet, and submissive, although the listener's behavior was held constant throughout. Such a contrast effect has also been demonstrated by Cline (1956). Cline devised a series of paired faces with various expressions (e.g. happy, glum). Subjects were asked to evaluate the nature of the situation and the characteristics of the two participants as portrayed by the faces. Cline

demonstrated that the characteristics attributed to the individual faces depended on the perception of the interaction. Subjects in the present study perceived the target and the listener within the context of the interaction. In this case, the nature of the interaction changed by varying the student's behavioral style (passive, assertive or aggressive). The variance thus produced altered the perception of the professor. These results suggest the importance of the contextual cues when evaluating the perception of a target person's behavior.

Other ratings of the listener were not affected by the varying behavior of the target. Although the behavior of the listener was perceived as varying on aggression, he/she was not rated any differently in terms of friendliness or popularity.

The sex of the listener also affected the manner in which he/she was perceived. A female listener was rated as more friendly, sincere, calm and polite but less sure in her conversations. Although this may appear to reflect the operation of sex-role stereotypes in the evaluation of the listener, such a conclusion can not be drawn from the present study. Since only one male and one female were enlisted to portray the role of the professor, the significant sex of listener effect could be attributed to individual differences. For example, vocal qualities and intonations would vary for the two listeners although the content was the same.

D. Idiosyncratic Effects

The significant idiosyncratic effects occuring in the present study reflect the differences of the actors employed to portray the role of the target. Therefore, it appears that characteristics of the individual such as voice quality and intonation effect how the target was perceived. No general pattern of influence was exhibited in the results, so it is difficult to determine if differences are attributable to one actor across conditions or different actors in different conditions.

The implications of the significant idiosyncratic effects can be directed toward practical aspects of assertion training. Many of the programs rely heavily on speech content without regard for the accompanying behavioral characteristics. They teach trainees what to say but not how to say it. Eisler, Miller and Hersen (1973) have described behavioral adjuncts which contribute to the perception of assertive behavior. For example, latency of response and loudness of the voice can augment or detract from the assertive communication. The Eisler et al study suggests that the behavioral components are important features of an assertive communication. It is also evident that the degree to which an individual exhibits these characteristics may differ widely from person to person. For example, a soft-spoken person may communicate the same aggressive content as a more boistrous person but it is likely that the latter would be perceived as more

aggressive. The results of the present study indicate that individual characteristics should be considered if assertive content is to be effectively communicated. Thus trainers of assertive behavior should consider the effect of the individual's verbal style as well as the content of the communication.

E. Androgyny and the Target Ratings

In general androgyny scores were not shown to be related to ratings of sex-role deviants, that is, aggressive and assertive females and passive males. The failure to demonstrate a relationship between ratings of sex-role deviants and subjects androgyny scores may be related to the achievment situation as suggested earlier. For example, aggressive and assertive behavior in females may not have been perceived as deviant in the achievement situation. Therefore, sex-typed individuals would not give more negative evaluations to aggressive and assertive females than to passive females. However, this does not explain the failure to associate androgyny scores with ratings of passive males. Another explanation could be an inherent weakness of the Bem scale, that is, self ratings on the Bem scale may not accurately reflect the level to which subjects adhere to specified sex-role stereotypes. For example, subjects adhering to sex-role stereotypes may not readily admit it in an experimental situation. Indeed, subjects may

respond with the current socially desirable characteristics. It is also possible that subjects' own identification with the sex-role stereotypes are unrelated to how they perceive others.

F. Conclusion

The implications of the findings for assertion training are numerous. First, support has been provided for the assumption that assertive behavior is distinct from aggressive and passive behavior. Another tenet of assertion training gleaning support is that assertive males and females were perceived as more competent than their passive counterparts, at least in achievement situations. Furthermore, assertive behavior did not result in any negative sanctions such as a loss in popularity. Other implications for assertion training are directed at a careful consideration of the situational and personal characteristics of the trainee. For example, whether the situation is achievement or socially oriented may be an important factor. In addition, the characteristics which the trainee brings to the situation may detract from or exaggerate the assertive communication. Indeed, all of these factors may be important in the effective transmission of an assertive message.

In general, no clear pattern emerged from the results of the present study. The complexity of determining

influential factors in person perception is illustrated. For example, the demonstration of sex-role stereotypes in certain situations but not in others may reflect a changing cultural trend in what constitutes sterotypic behavior. As more and more females pursue traditionally masculine vocations the definition of deviation from the sex-role stereotype changes.

References

Alberti, Robert E., Emmons, Michael L. Your Perfect Right: A Guide to Assertive Behavior. San Luis Obispo, California: Impact, 1970.

Bem, S.L. The measurement of psychological androgeny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42, 155-162.

Bloom, L., Coburn, K., & Pearlman, J. The New Assertive Woman. New York: Delacote Press, 1975.

Bower, S., Bower, G. Asserting Yourself: A Practical Guide for Positive Change. Peaching, Massechusetts: Addision-Wesley, 1976.

Broverman, I., Broverman, D. M., Clarboon, F. E., Rosenkrantz, P., & Vogel, S. Sex-role stereotypes and clinical judgments of mental health. Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology. 1970, 34, 1-7.

Butler, P. Self-assertion for Women: A Guide to Becoming Androgynous. San Francisco: Canfield Press, 1976.

Chessler, P. A word about mental health and women. Mental Health, 1973,57, 5-7.

Cline, M. G. The influence of social context on the perception of faces. Journal of Personality, 1956, 25, 142-158.

Costrich, N., Feinstein, J., Kidder, L., Marecek, J., & Pascale, L. When stereotypes hurt: three studies of penalties for sex-role reversals. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology. 1975, 11, 520-530.

Eisler, R. M., Miller, P. M., Hersen, M., & Alford, H. Effects of assertion training on marital interaction. Archieves of General Psychiatry, 1974, 30, 643-649.

Eisler, R., Mutler, P., Hersen, M. Components of assertive behavior . Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1973, 29, 295-299.

Hall, J., &Black, D. Assertiveness, aggressiveness and attitudes toward feminism. Journal of Social Psychology, 1979, 107, 57-62.

Heimberg, R. G., Montgomery, D., Madsen, C. H., & Heimberg, J. S. Assertion training: a review of the literature. Behavior Therapy, 1977, 8, 953-971.

Hollandsworth, J. Differentiating assertion and aggression: some behavioral guidelines. Behavior Therapy, 1977,8, 347-352.

Jakubowski-Spector, P. A. Facilitating the growth of women through assertive training. The Counselling Psychologist, 1973, 4, 75-86.

Kravetz, D. Sex role stereotypes of women. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1976, 4, 437-443.

Kwiterovich, D., &Horan, J. Solomon evaluation of a commercial assertiveness program for women. Behavior Therapy, 1977, 8,501-502.

Landau, P. A. A guide for the assertive book buyer. Human Behavior, 1976, 5, 64-71.

Lazarus, A. A. Behavior rehearsal vs. nondirective therapy vs. advice in affecting behavior change. Behavior

Research and Therapy, 1966, 4, 209-212.

Muchowski, P., & Valle, S. Effects of assertive training on trainees and their spouses. Journal of Marriage & Family Counselling, 1977, 3, 57-62.

Osborn, S., & Harris, G. Assertive Training for Women, Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1975.

O'Neil, P., & Roitzsch, J. Assertiveness training for alcohol abusers-rationale and application. British Journal on Alcohol and Alcoholism, 1977, 12, 107-113.

Phelps, S., & Austin, N. The assertive woman. Fredericksburg, Va: Bookerafters, 1975.

Rathus, S. Principles and practices of assertive training: an eclectic overview. Counselling Psychologist, 1975, 5, 9-20.

Rich, A., & Schroeder, H. E. Research issures in assertiveness training. Psychological Bulletin, 1976, 83, 1081-1096.

Wolfe, J., & Fodor, I. Modifying assertive behavior in women: a comparison of three approaches. Behavior Therapy, 1977, 8,567-574.

Appendix A

Script A: Professor and Student Discuss Exam

1. Passive Script
2. Assertive Script
3. Aggressive Script

A. Professor and Student Discuss Exam

1. Passive Script

Student (St.) : My name is Stewart (Susan) Morgan. I'm a student in your introductory biology course.

Instructor (I) : Come in and sit down, Stewart (Susan). Now what can I do for you.

St: I seem to be having a hard time with the course. I got a low grade on the last exam even after I studied very hard for it.

I : Well, what was your grade?

St: I only got 65% which is really not high enough for entering Medical School.

I : What do you think was the problem?

St: Well ..... I'm not sure. I guess I don't know.

I : What would you like me to do?

St: Would you mind very much explaining to me the mistakes I made on the exam. I know you must be very busy and I'm sorry to take up so much of your time, but do you think it would be possible to go over my exam?

I : All right, I can do that. Do you have your exam with you?

St: Uh ..... yes, I think so. Just a minute, while I find it ..... here it is.

I : Now let's see. Well, on the first page you lost points on three out of the five short answer questions.

St: I really did poorly on the first question although at the time I thought my answer might be okay.

I : You have named the different organisms correctly, but your descriptions are too short. You lost marks for that reason.

St: Oh, I'm sorry. I must have misunderstood.

I : For each point that you failed to include in the descriptions you lost two marks. There are several correct answers to choose from and I expected more than just one.

St: Gee, I didn't know that. Was that written on the exam?

I : That's a good point. I'll be sure the questions are clear on the next exam.

St: What did you find was my mistake on the other two questions?

I : Let me reread them quickly ..... Oh, yeah you failed to mention the importance of phylogenetic classification systems in the second question. I explicitly asked for the "importance" in the question.

St: Oh gee, I must have forgotten to reread my own question to be sure I included everything. Oh, well, can you tell me what I did wrong in question five?

I : You didn't answer the question. You've confused amoebas and protozoans. The question refers to amoebas but your answer refers only to protozoans.

St: I see now. I guess I wasn't thinking clearly. Ah ..... in the multiple choice section I really had a lot of trouble understanding a couple of questions.

I : Which ones?

St: Numbers six and ten.

I : Oh yeah, I realized in marking the exam that the wording on those two questions is ambiguous. I probably won't use them on an exam again.

St: Will you still be counting them for this exam?

I : Well, the class distribution remains the same if I excluded those questions or not. Your class standing wouldn't change so I see no point in changing it now.

St: I'm sorry to keep complaining. You must have a lot of people complaining about their grades?

I : No, not too many actually.

St: Would you mind very much if I ask you one more question? I'm sorry to take up so much of your time, I know you must be busy.

I : What is it?

St: I didn't do very well on the essay question and I was wondering if you could tell me what I did wrong?

I : Well, I gave five marks for each of five main points plus extra credit for organization. Your essay appears to be rather long and I really don't have the time right now to reread it. Could you come back tomorrow at 3, we can discuss it then?

St: Well, I can come back tomorrow if you're sure it wouldn't be too much trouble.

I : I'll have another look at it and we can go over it tomorrow.

St: I guess the essay question is the only hope I have to raise

my grade in this course. I sure hope it works out. Thank you very much for your time. Good bye.

I : Good bye.

A. Professor and Student Discuss Exam

2. Assertive Script

Student (St) : My name is Stewart (Susan) Morgan. I'm a student in your introductory biology course.

Instructor(I): Come in and sit down, Stewart (Susan). Now what can I do for you?

St: On the last examination I received a rather low grade which I do not feel I deserved.

I : Well, what was your grade?

St: My grade was 65% but I worked very hard and I need to do better if I'm every going to get into Medical School.

I : What do you think was the problem?

St: I feel I was prepared for the exam so I cannot understand why I didn't do better.

I : What would you like me to do?

St: I would appreciate it if you would explain your grading system to me and I would like to go over my exam with you so I can see how the marks were assigned.

I : All right, I can do that. Do you have your exam with you?

St: Yes, here it is.

I : Now let's see. Well, on the first page you lost points on three out of the five short answer questions.

St: I think my answer to the first one is sufficient for full marks. You said list five organisms and describe them and that is exactly what I did.

I : You <u>have</u> named the different organisms correctly, but your

descriptions are too short. You lost marks for that reason.

St: I don't think they are too short. I would be interested to know on what basis you took off those marks. What were your criteria?

I : For each point that you failed to include in the description you lost two marks. There <u>are</u> several correct answers to choose from and I expected more than just one.

St: I think it would be helpful if you would let us know how marks are assigned for each question.

I : That's a good point. I'll be sure that the questions are clear on the next exam.

St: Why did I lose marks on the other two questions?

I : Let me reread them quickly ..... Oh yeah, you failed to mention the importance of phylogenetic classification systems in the second question. I explicitly asked for "<u>importance</u>" in the question.

St: I thought I had included everything. For example, on question five, I can't find anything wrong with my answer. It compares favourably with the textbook description.

I : You didn't answer the question. You've confused Amoebas and protozoans. The question refers to amoebas but your answer refers only to protozoans.

St: I see my mistake now. I must have been confused when I wrote the exam. Could we go on to the multiple choice questions then? There are two questions which I think are poorly worded.

I : Which ones?

St: Numbers six and ten.

I : Oh yeah, I realized in marking the exam that the wording on those two questions is ambiguous. I probably won't use them on an exam again.

St: Will you be giving the two marks to the total score?

I : Well, the class distribution remains the same if I excluded those questions or not. Your class standing wouldn't change so I really see no point in changing it now.

St: I am disappointed to hear that. You must get a lot of people complaining about their grades?

I : No, not too many actually.

St: I have one more question concerning the exam.

I : What is it?

St: On the essay question I received half marks although I thought my answer was quite good. Can you tell me what your criteria were for marking the essay? I would like to go over my essay with you.

I : Well, I gave five marks for each of five main points plus extra credit for organization. Your essay appears to be rather long and I really don't have the time right now to reread it. Could you come back tomorrow at 3, we can discuss it then?

St: Yes, I can come back tomorrow.

I : I'll have another look at it and we can go over it then.

St: Okay. I hope some additional marks can be found on the essay question. I would really like to raise my grade in this course. I appreciate your help on this. Good bye.

I : Good bye.

A. Professor and Student Discuss Exam

3. Aggressive Script

Student (St) : My name is Stewart (Susan) Morgan. I'm a student in your introductory biology course.

Instructor(I) : Come in and sit down, Stewart (Susan). Now what can I do for you.

St: I'm quite upset about the grade you gave me on the last exam. In fact I'm angry that the grading was so unfair.

I : Well, what was your grade?

St: You only gave me 65%. I'm applying for medical school and a grade like this could keep me out. I won't stand for it.

I : What do you think was the problem?

St: Your grading system is too harsh and I demand an explanation.

I : What would you like me to do?

St: I think it is your responsibility to tell me exactly how you arrived at my grade. I want to know how you assign marks and I want you to have another look at my exam in case you made a mistake in marking it.

I : All right. I can do that. Do you have your exam with you?

St: Of course. Here.

I : Now let's see. Well, on the first page you lost points on three out of the five short answer questions.

St: I certainly think those questions are marked incorrectly. On the first question I'm sure I'm right. I did every thing you asked for but still took off marks.

I : You have named the organisms correctly, but your descriptions are a little too short. You lost marks for that reason.

St: Why do you think my answers are too short?

I : For each point that you failed to include in the description you lost two marks. There are several correct answers to choose from and I expected more than just one.

St: I think it's unfair to lose marks because you didn't bother making it clear exactly what you wanted.

I : That's a good point. I'll be sure the questions are clear on the next exam.

St: What about my answers on the other two questions?

I : Let me reread them quickly ..... Oh yeah, you failed to mention the importance of phylogenetic classification systems in the second question. I explicitly asked for the "importance" in the question.

St: Let me see that question. I don't remember your asking that. It certainly wasn't clear to me. And what about question five. My answer is right out of the textbook so I know you must have made a mistake on that one.

I : You didn't answer the question. You've confused amoebas and protozoans. The question refers to amoebas only but your answer refers to protozoans.

St: Your exam is too confusing and poorly designed. Even some of the multiple choice questions are ambiguous.

I : Which ones?

St: Numbers six and ten.

I : Oh yeah, I realized in marking the exam that the wording on those two questions is ambiguous. I probably won't use them on an exam again.

St: Then you will be adding two additional marks to my score?

I : Well, the class distribution remains the same if I include those questions or not. Your class standing wouldn't change so I really see no point in changing it now.

St: I really think that's unfair. There should be a lot of people complaining about this exam.

I : No, not too many actually.

St: I have one more question for your and I hope you can give me a satisfactory answer.

I : What is it?

St: My answer for the essay question was quite good. I think it demonstrates my knowledge of biology but you only gave me half marks. There must be some mistake.

I : Well, I gave five marks for each of five main points plus extra credit for organization. Your essay appears to be rather long and I really don't have the time right now to reread it. Could you come back tomorrow at 3, we can discuss it then?

St: I don't see why I should come back tomorrow. You should be able to tell at a glance why you've misgraded my paper.

I : I'll have another look at it and we can go over it tomorrow.

St: If you read my essay carefully this time, I'm sure you'll find the points you overlooked before. I really want to raise my grade in this course so I hope I don't have to take this over your head. Good bye.

Appendix B

Script B: A Friend Requesting a Favour

1. Passive Script
2. Assertive Script
3. Aggressive Script

B. A Friend Requesting a Favour

1. Passive Script

Ringgggg!

Harry: Hello

Tom : Hello, Harry? How are you? This is Tom speaking.

Harry: Oh, hello Tom. I'm fine, how are you?

Tom : Well, I'm okay I guess, only I seem to have this awful problem with my car.

Harry: What's the matter?

Tom : Well, uh, last night I sort of parked my car where I wasn't supposed to, so I guess the police came and towed it away.

Harry: Oh, no!

Tom : Boy, I really wish they hadn't towed my car away. Lots of other cars were parked there too.

Harry: That is bad luck! Do you have to pay a fine?

Tom : Yes, I'm afraid so. They're making me pay a $50 fine plus towing and storage charges.

Harry: I'm sorry to hear that.

Tom : My car is at the auto wreckers right now. And well that's why I'm calling you. You see, I was wondering if it would be possible for you to give me a lift to the wreckers to pick up my car sometime? That, if you don't mind. I know its an imposition.

Harry: When do you want to go?

Tom : Well, they told me I'd have to pick it up before 7 tomorrow morning or else they'll make me pay for another whole day of storage.

Harry: Do you want to pick it up tonight?

Tom : Well, uh, tonight would be okay except that I really had sorta planned to do something else. Do you think it would inconvenience you too much if we went tomorrow morning?

Harry: But tomorrow's Saturday! I really look forward to sleeping in on Saturday.

Tom : Oh, I really am sorry to be such a bother. I don't suppose you would consider sleeping in on Sunday ..... just this once.

Harry: I guess I can help you out this once. Where is this place anyway? (reluctantly)

Tom : I'm afraid its way out on highway 37, East of town.

Harry: Hmmmm, that's quite a distance.

Tom : I know its a long way; altogether its about a half hour drive. We'd probably have to leave here by 6:15 if that's alright with you?

Harry: That early!

Tom : I'm sorry Harry, I was hoping you wouldn't mind doing this since we're friends and all.

Harry: I don't suppose you could find someone else, could you?

Tom : I've really tried, honest, but nobody else seems able to

do it. ..... Maybe ..... No, I guess that wouldn't work.

Harry: What is it?

Tom : Well, I was just thinking that maybe, if its all right with you, maybe I could get someone else to go with me, only, well, do you think it would be possible to use your car?

Harry: I don't know, I've never let anyone else drive my car before.

Tom : Oh, well it was just a thought. I'll try to think of something else. Thanks any way Harry.

Harry: Wait a minute Tom, let me call my insurance agent to be sure another driver would be covered on my insurance. Then I'll call you back and we can try to work something out.

Tom : Oh, thank you very very much.

Harry: I'll call back within the hour. Talk to you then. Bye.

Tom : Bye.

B. A Friend Requesting a Favour

2. Assertive Script

Ringgggg!

Harry: Hello

Tom : Hello, Harry? How are you? This is Tom.

Harry: Oh, hello Tom. I'm fine, how are you?

Tom : I'm fine except I have a problem with my car.

Harry: What's the matter?

Tom : Last night I left my car parked in a no parking zone and the police towed it away.

Harry: Oh no!

Tom : Out of all the cars parked there mine's the one that got towed. You can bet I won't park there again.

Harry: That is bad luck! Do you have to pay a fine?

Tom : Yes, unfortunately. The fine is $50 plus towing and storage charges.

Harry: I'm sorry to hear that.

Tom : Harry, could you drive me over to the auto wreckers to pick up my car. I'd really appreciate it.

Harry: When do you want to go?

Tom : I want to pick it up before 7 tomorrow morning otherwise I'll have to pay for another whole day of storage.

Harry: Do you want to pick it up tonight?

Tom : Well, I've already made other plans for tonight. Tomorrow morning really is the only time I can go.

Harry: But tomorrow's Saturday! I really look forward to sleeping in on Saturday!

Tom : I know you do and I wouldn't ask you if I didn't need your help this one time. You could sleep in on Sunday morning.

Harry: (reluctantly) Well, I guess I can help you out this once. Where is this place anyway?

Tom : It's East of town on highway 37.

Harry: Hmmmm, that's quite a distance.

Tom : Yes, it takes altogether about a half hour to get there so we should leave here by 6:15.

Harry: That <u>early</u>?

Tom : I get the feeling you really don't want to take me out there. I know it's early but I don't know any other way to get there.

Harry: I don't suppose you could find someone else, could you?

Tom : No one else I know is available. ..... Say, I have an idea.

Harry: What is it?

Tom : If you'd lend me your car I could get someone else to go with me.

Harry: I don't know, I've never let any one else drive my car before.

Tom : Oh, well if you'd rather not I understand.

Harry: Wait a minute Tom, let me call my insurance agent to be sure another driver would be covered on my insurance.

Then I'll call you back and we can try to work something out.

Tom : That would be great. Thanks Harry.

Harry: I'll call back in about an hour. Talk to you then. Bye.

Tom : Good bye.

B. A Friend Requesting a Favour

3. Aggressive Script

Ringggg!

Harry: Hello?

Tom : Hello, Harry? How are ya? Tom here.

Harry: Oh, hello Tom, I'm fine, how are you?

Tom : I've got a problem with my car.

Harry: What's the matter?

Tom : Last night the police towed my car away just because it was parked in a no parking zone.

Harry: Oh no!

Tom : But what irks me is that my car wasn't the only one parked there. I don't know why they had to pick my car to tow away.

Harry: That is bad luck! Do you have to pay a fine?

Tom : I sure do! I have to pay those creeps $50 plus towing and storage charges.

Harry: I'm sorry to hear that.

Tom : Not as sorry as I am. My car's at the auto wreckers right now. Would you give me a lift over there to pick it up?

Harry: When do you want to go?

Tom : I have to pick it up before 7 tomorrow otherwise I get charged for another whole day of storage.

Harry: Do you want to pick it up tonight?

Tom : No, I can't tonight, I'm busy. It will have to be tomorrow morning.

Harry: But tomorrow's Saturday! I really look forward to sleeping in on Saturday.

Tom : Look, it's just this once. After all its not like I ask you to do me a favor very often. You can sleep in Sunday morning.

Harry: (reluctantly) Well, I guess I can help you out this once. Where is this place any way?

Tom : Oh, its just outside of town on highway 37, East of here.

Harry: Hmmmm, that's quite a distance!

Tom : It takes about a half hour to get there so we'd better leave by 6:15.

Harry: That <u>early</u>!

Tom : If you don't want to take me out there why don't you just say so. I thought you were my friend and would be gald to help me out but if you really can't be bothered I'll have to try something else.

Harry: I don't suppose you could find someone else, could you?

Tom : There just isn't anybody else available. I'm really counting on you. ..... Say, I've got an idea!

Harry: What is it?

Tom : Why don't you lend me your car? I can get someone else to go along with me.

Harry: I don't know, I've never let any one else drive my car before.

Tom: Okay, forget it. But don't ever ask me for any favors.

Thanks for nothing.

Harry: Wait a minute Tom, let me call my insurance agent to be sure another driver would be covered on my insurance. Then I'll call you back and we can try to work something out.

Tom : That sounds like a good idea. Thanks, Harry.

Harry: I'll call back within the hour. Talk to you then. Bye.

Tom : Good bye.

Appendix C

Pilot Study Questionnaire

1. Following, is a list of adjectives frequently used to describe people. Please circle the number that you feel best describes the student. For example, if you feel the student is very friendly, then circle the number 1 on the first scale below; if you feel the student is very unfriendly circle the 7. If you feel the student is neither friendly nor unfriendly circle the 4. Choose any one number from 1 to 7 which you feel is the most accurate. Please make one rating on each of the 7 scales.

friendly	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	unfriendly
insincere	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	sincere
passive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	aggressive
dishonest	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	honest
assertive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	nonassertive
rude	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	polite
confident	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	unsure

2. Please mark one of the three statements below which best describes your impression of the student:

_____ I think the student's behavior is best described as AGGRESSIVE.

_____ I think the student's behavior is best described as ASSERTIVE.

_____ I think the student's behavior is best described as PASSIVE.

Appendix D

Instructions to Subjects

Subjects will be seated and the experimenter introduced.

First of all, I would like to tell you something about the experiment you have signed up for. We know that people often form impressions of others based on various kinds of information. For example, a person may form an impression of another based on appearance. Psychologists want to find out more about how people form impressions of others. In this experiment we want to find out something about the impressions people make on the basis of what others say, and the manner in which they say it. We would like you to listen to a tape recording of a conversation and then answer some questions on the conversation. Do not put your name on the answer sheet so that your responses will be completely confidential. We would appreciate it, however, if you would please place an M or F in the top right hand corner: M designating male and F designating female. At the completion of the experiment I will explain more fully what the study is about. Are there any questions?

In a few minutes I will be asking you to put the headphones on and listen to a tape recording. The recording is of a discussion between two people. Each of you will be listening to a different discussion. The conversations are about seven minutes long so please listen very carefully. When I tell you to begin, put the headphones on and push the start button on the cassette player. The start button is marked with green tape. If you need to adjust the volume, turn the button marked with blue tape. When the discussion is over you

will be instructed on the tape to turn the cassette player off by pushing the stop button marked with red tape. At that time please remove your headphones and wait until I distribute some questionnaires. Do you have any questions about the way the cassette player works? Be sure you listen carefully to the taped conversation so that you can give us your impressions. Are there any questions at this time? Then you may begin.

Appendix E

Main Study Questionnaire

Part 1.

Please place a mark by one of the two statements below which best describes how you wouls respond if you were the professor.

_____ I would probably raise the student's grade

_____ I would probably not raise the student's grade

Part 2.

Following, is a list of adjectives frequently used to describe people. Please circle the number that you feel best describes the student. For example, if you feel the student is very friendly, then circle the 1. on the first scale below. If you feel the student is very unfriendly circle the 7. If you feel the student is neither friendly, nor unfriendly, circle the 4. Choose any one number from 1 to 7 which you feel is the most appropriate. Please make on rating on each of the 14 scales.

friendly	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	unfriendly
quiet	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	outspoken
sincere	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	insincere
passive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	aggressive
incompetent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	competent
nervous	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	calm
assertive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	unassertive
polite	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	rude
popular	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	unpopular

bold	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	timid
confident	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	unsure
adventurous	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	retiring
submissive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	dominant
honest	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	dishonest

Part 3.

Following, is the same list of adjectives frequently used to describe people. This time, please circle the number that you feel best describes the professor.

friendly	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	unfriendly
quiet	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	outspoken
sincere	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	insincere
passive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	aggressive
incompetent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	competent
nervous	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	calm
assertive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	unassertive
polite	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	rude
popular	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	unpopular
bold	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	timid
confident	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	unsure
adventurous	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	retiring
submissive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	dominant
honest	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	dishonest

Part 4.

For the following list of adjectives and adjective phrases please circle the number which you feel best describes yourself. For example, on the first scale circle the 1 if you feel that you are never self-reliant. If you feel that you are always self-reliant circle the 7. If you feel that half the time you are self-reliant while half of the time you are not then circle the 4. Choose the number between 1 and 7 which you feel is the most appropriate and circle it. Please make only one rating for each of the 30 scales. (Please note that your responses will be kept confidential).

	never true						always true
self-reliant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
yielding	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
helpful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
defends own beliefs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
cheerful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
moody	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
aggressive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
shy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
conscientious	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
athletic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
affectionate	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
theatrical	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
assertive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
flatterable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

	never true						always true
happy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strong personality	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
loyal	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
unpredictable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
forceful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
feminine	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
reliable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
analytical	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
sympathetic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
jealous	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
willing to take risks	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
understanding	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
truthful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
makes decisions easily	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
compassionate	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
secretive	1	2	33	4	5	6	7